

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_100832
Title of the Manuscript:	Back to Square One: Attempted legal amendments and abortion practices in Sri Lanka
Type of the Article	Policy Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, this the manuscript important for scientific community as forms part of policy formulation and legal framework</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable</p> <p>3. No, the abstract need improvement to include summary and recommendation based on findings</p> <p>4. No, subsections need to show global overview and then narrow down to Sri Lanka and show the conclusion summarizing key findings leading to way forward.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct but with minor improvement</p> <p>6. The references are recent but need to add others comparing various levels of economy (developed and developing). Include more references on laws and case study findings from other economy of the same size.</p> <p>7. Include in the manuscript correlation to show impact of independents variables to the dependent variable.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. English used is good</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is sound for policy formulation and need minor inputs in showing impact of control variables</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ntegereze Peter
Department, University & Country	Rwanda